Dear Sylvia,

thanks very much for your fast reply - and the long letter. It is rather odd that you talked with G. at about the same time that I did, but, when I come to think of it, it is not odd at all. He is , apparently, calling up on everybody to count his fans and see where he stands.

All that talk he gave you about POI9I06 and the FBI & CIA phone numbers and the " subjective" coding of Oswald, he had also given me, litterally word by word. So ,I suppose it is his new stand now - and a rather fragile and scary one, I must say ... Of course, my paper wouldn't buy that story - and even though, a few days later, we received, through the press agencies, the text of G.'s interview with a local radio (or TV) station saying most of what he had told me (CIA involved, etc ...), we didn't make a splash of it. I decided not to call him back, because, on the phone, he is, as you say, elusive and sugarsweet and never really answers the right questions - and I thought I should start keeping some distance between him and me and, rather, I sent him a couple of long letters.Not insulting at all, rather " patronizing" - in his own way! - to explain to him that we couldn't quite eat up that sort of s... in Europe - and giving him a piece of advice on his way of behaving with the US press, which I am sure he will not follow. But, as a professional newsman, I still had to acknowledge the fact that he had taken the trouble to call me and give me some infos. even though it was for his own benefit.

I ended the letters on a friendly note, but a rather cool one and if he doesn't understand how disappointed am I, then he is not even the subtle mind. I thank he is - and, anyway, when the time comes - whichI am sure it will - I'll have to tell him all these things in N.O. face to face. For, Sylvia, and this is a recomforating thought, he'll have to come out with some sort of explanation or way out. There will be a "showdown" - and I'll be there. I mean, people like Clay Shaw are not just going to let it drop - if they're completely innocent. And G. will be faced with a lot of accusators...

Incidentally, I had diner with this girl from N.O. who was in Faris - she's the wife of a Life man there, they were very favorable to G. but, like everybody else, they become disillusioned, etc..etc..the same old story - and anyway, she talked about Shaw in very interesting terms - not discounting the fact that, indeed, with his connections and his way of life, he may very well have been involved with the CIA(confidentially of course, all this But she says he seems and acts and behaves and talks like a completely innocent man - as far as the JFK probe goes . She also says NBC is preparing a show called "Rise& Fall of J.m G.". That will be fun to watch... As for CBS, I know one of their men, Joe WErshba, was very favorable towardG. when I was there. In fact, he helped convince me of G.'s seriousness. I don't know how Joe

stands as of now. You might get in touch with him. He's based in New York and has had more access to G. than anybody else. But, he had already told me that, indeed, the CBS special programs would not distroy the Warren Report - on the contrary...

By the way, I also have "Crime Law and Corrections" on my desk. G. gave it to me very solemnly before I left. I read the piece and indeed it is a good and honest one. But, what does it prove? The fact that he should give this huge book with this slim text of his as a token of honesty and seriousness to anybody who comes along does not reassure me a bit. It is as if to say: "You don't believe me? Read this! "Two completely different problems, I am afraid.

All this storyx is getting slimmer and slimmer here, compared to other problems (Vietnam, de Gaulle's activities, etc.) and the wires are getting scarce. So, if anything new comes out, not big enough to cross the Atlantic but big enough to signify something, don't forget to keep me up with it. I don't expect to receive any more calls from G - although one never knows...

Best as ever, Sylvia - and good luck on your book,

megte.